DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 426 CS 505 028

AUTHOR Shockley-Zalabak, Pamela; Staley, Constance Courtney
TITLE The Female Professional: Communication Proficiencies as Predictors of Organizational Advancement.
PUB DATE [84]
NOTE 29p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Research; *Communication Skills; *Employed Women; Employer Employee Relationship; *Employment Opportunities; Employment Practices; Interpersonal Communication; Leadership Qualities; Organizational Communication; Personnel Management

ABSTRACT

Based on the assumption that communication skills are a critical component of organizational effectiveness and "promotability," a study was conducted to investigate the perceptions supervisors have of their female employees' communication proficiency. In particular, comparisons were made between evaluations of supervisors on a variety of communication competencies and female employees' self-evaluations. Subjects were 61 female professionals and their 61 immediate supervisors, who completed a communication proficiency and training survey designed to determine present levels of communication proficiency and future training needs. Respondents were also asked for particular demographic information, which was used in computing their Managerial Achievement Quotients: the number of promotions received since initial employment with the organization and current age bracket. The results supported the importance of self and supervisor evaluation of communication competencies for organizational achievement. Specifically, female professionals whose supervisors evaluate highly their ability to motivate others and understand organizational problems are more likely to advance vertically in the organization than those not as highly evaluated. Likewise, female professionals who favorably evaluate their own ability to give directions and participate in groups are more likely to be high achievers. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED261426

THE FEMALE PROFESSIONAL: COMMUNICATION PROFICIENCIES AS PREDICTORS OF ORGANIZATIONAL ADVANCEMENT

Pamela Shockley-Zalabak
Department of Communication
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
P O Box 7150
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80933-7150
(303) 593-3159

Constance Courtney Staley
Department of Communication
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
P O Box 7150
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80933-7150
(303) 593-3486

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Pamela Shockley-Zalabak
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 505 028

ABSTRACT

This research investigates the perceptions supervisors have of their female employees' communication proficiency, assuming, as has been repeatedly discussed in the literature, that communication skills are a critical component of organizational effectiveness and promotability. In particular, comparisons were made between evaluations of supervisors on a variety of communication competencies and female employees' self-evaluations. Both self and supervisory evaluations were utilized as predictors of female achievement levels. Data were analyzed with the step-wise multiple regression technique. With 25 communication and training variables accounting for .99 of the variance, the most powerful finding of this research is the importance of communication competencies for organizational achievement.

INTRODUCTION

In the last decade, with more and more females entering the labor force, managerial women have become the focus of a growing body of research. Researchers have asked: Are women really equipped to play the corporate game? Do they fear success? Do they have what it takes to become successful managers? What do top executives think about women managers? Who or what is responsible for the stereotype that female managers are less competent than their male counterparts? Do women have the communication skills necessary for organizational advancement? (Donnell & Hall, 1980).

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

Perhaps the most important finding to emerge from the plethora of research on managerial women is the number of studies which note a lack of significant differences between female managers and their male counterparts. Shockley (1981), for example, found no differences in the choice of conflict style reported by male and female managers. Likewise, Birdsall (1978) found that female and male managers used similar communication styles during staff meetings. Osborn and Vicars (1976), in their data from two organizations, found no consistent effect of leader sex on leader behavior or on subordinate satisfaction. Similarly, a comprehensive review of the literature on leadership by Bartol (1977) indicated little difference in female and male leaders' styles of leadership, levels of job satisfaction, or group output. In fact, in a large-scale, multifaceted study of nearly 2000 male and female managers' managerial philosophy, motivation to work, participative practices, interpersonal competence, and management style, Donnell and Hall (1980)

This Research was funded in part through a grant from the Research and Creative Works Committee, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, 1984.

found only two overall differences: Female managers' work motivation profiles were more "achieving", and male managers were more open and candid with their colleagues. According to Miner (1973), "women appear to manage well for essentially the same reasons men do--that is, existing criteria for excellence are equally appropriate for both" (p. 148). Albanese and Helriegel (1977, cited in White, Crino, and DeSanctis, 1981, p. 235) in commenting on the significance of significant differences between male and female managers in motivation to manage and problem solving styles, observe that "the differences between sexes on the dimensions investigated . . . are trivial compared to the range of differences found within each sex". They suggest that increased efforts should be made to examine within-sample characteristics.

As pointed out by Staley (1984), however, "reports of no differences . . . may have little to do with the attitudinal and practical difficulties women face" (p. 323). Some research results indicate that male and female managers generally hold similar and often negative attitudes toward managerial women (Rosen & Jerdee, 1973, 1974a, 1974b). Schein (1973) and later Massengill and DiMarco (1979) asked male middle managers to rate men in general, women in general, and successful middle managers on their temperaments, attitudes, and characteristics. On 60 of 86 items, managers and men were rated similarly; however, on only eight items were women rated as similar to successful middle managers. Feldman-Summers and Kiesler (1974) were not able to identify a single occupation, including traditionally "female" occupations, in which females were expected to be more successful than males.

Perhaps because of such prevailing attitudes, women tend to remain in low-level management positions, rather than advance up the ranks as do their male counterparts (Day & Stogdill, 1972). In their study of women in management training programs, Shockley and Staley (1980) found that 70% of respondents reported that women were not promoted as frequently as men in their organizations. Indeed, uneven upward mobility rates for males and females, coupled with currently reported salary discrepancies of between $2,000 and $18,000 (Fraker, 1984), are examples of the practical difficulties faced by women.

In contrast to these practical difficulties, some researchers identify a growing body of empirical literature providing evidence that women are experiencing managerial success (White, et al., 1981). Schwartz (1971, cited in White et al., 1981), for example, found that 95% of employers of women managers rated their performance on the job as excellent, very good, or good. Jabes (1980) found strong evidence that women managers are positively biased toward other women managers. Wood (1976) polled nearly 100 male and female managers and discovered that most managers believe women are proving their competence and winning increased acceptance in the organizational environment. In a recent field investigation of a large corporation and a follow-up study, Tsui and Gutek (1984) reported that women managers were promoted faster and were more satisfied with their jobs than their male counterparts.

Encouraging results such as these, on the other hand, exist alongside numerous examples of studies which suggest the continued prevalence of stereotypes and discrimination. Matteson (1976), for example, found less

positive attitudes toward women managers among male managers. Furthermore, attitudes toward women managers became less favorable for both males and females with increased work experience. In an extensive survey of 1500 managers who subscribed to Harvard Business Review, Rosen and Jerdee (1974b) found greater organizational concern for men's careers over the careers of women and skepticism about women's ability to balance career and home demands. Ezell, Odewahn, and Sherman (1980) found that female managers generally reported higher levels of self-competence than did males, although women managers believed other women managers were less competent than male managers, in contrast to results found by Jabes (1980).

According to some researchers (i.e., Bartol, 1978) a critical area of research, sometimes overlooked, is the perceptions of female managers' superiors. White, et al., (1981) identify two barriers to women's selection of managerial careers: Due to poor training and lack of interest, the majority of women do not choose careers in management, causing the career field to remain male-dominated, and secondly, prejudice and discrimination against women by current and prospective employers at the time of selection and throughout their careers still exists. "Thus it is probable that the most important factor in determining the selection of potential managers and leaders is not actual or even perceived behavior, but rather, how the behavior is evaluated" (Hollander & Julian, 1979; cited in White, et al., 1981). Evaluators are constrained by their judgments, values, and perceptions of role behaviors. If evaluators' perceptions of the female role are not compatible with their perceptions of the managerial role, these conflicting sets of role expectations may

affect evaluations of performance (White, et al., 1981). According to Schein (1978), stereotyped thinking by superiors about a woman's capability to function effectively as a manager may limit her ability to perform well and to be promoted. If a superior perceives that a woman is less aggressive, competitive, or forceful than her male counterpart, her superior may not require of the woman tasks which utilize such skills. This, in turn, may limit the female professional, keep her from developing these abilities, promote within the organization an image that she cannot perform these tasks, and thereby restrict her promotional progress.

Support for this perspective was found in a recent study by Staley and Shockley (1984) who reported little agreement between female professionals and their superiors on either assessed communication competencies or need for future training. In assessments of 15 areas of communication proficiency, a woman and her supervisor agreed only on the woman's proficiency in the areas of business writing, oral presentations, and communications technology. Likewise, in comparing assessed need for future training in these 15 areas, agreement was found in only four areas: interviewing, oral presentations, communications technology, and diagnosing organizational problems. The authors suggest that the significance of their findings does not lie in the areas of agreement between female professionals and their supervisors. Rather, the lack of agreement for both communication proficiencies and assessed training needs in critically complex competencies such as group decision-making, interpersonal relationships, motivating people, and delegating authority may be key to understanding the managerial development of female

professionals and their subsequent promotional progress.

The evaluation of females and the effect sex-role stereotyping has on the evaluation process is not clearly understood. Nieva and Gutek (1980) suggest that a potential external barrier to women at work is prejudicial evaluation of females' qualifications and performance. They note that while employee evaluation should be objectively based on merit, extensive documentation exists of deviation from these ideals. Patterson (1975), in a study of 192 male and female managers, found that females were consistently rated more poorly than males on evaluations of performance and promotability. Deaux (1979), on the other hand, found no differences in the performance ratings given to male and female managers by superiors; however, women's self-ratings tended to be lower. Hall and Hall (1976) found no sex differences in rating of motivation, ability, or overall task performance. Hagen and Kahn (1975), in a laboratory study to compare reactions to competent and incompetent women under competitive, cooperative, or observational conditions, found that everyone generally liked competents rather than incompetents; however, males preferred competent females to incompetent ones only when the females were at a distance (the observational condition).

On the other hand, some studies have found higher ratings for female leadership than for male leadership on equivalent performance. Jacobson and Effertz (1974) found such results, citing Samuel Johnson's remark on women preachers in the eighteenth-century: "Sir, a woman preaching is like a dog's walking on his hind legs. It is not done well: but you are very surprised to find it done at all." Abramson, Goldberg, Greenberg,

and Abramson (1977) have referred to similar findings as the "talking platypus phenomenon".

Such discrepancies may be explained in part by an understanding of the process of evaluation, which includes not only a judgment about the worth of a performance but also the attribution of causality: ability, effort, task difficulty, and luck (Nieva & Gutek, 1980). These four causal explanations for the quality of performance may be characterized as internal or external and as either stable or unstable. Performance is seen to be maximally predictable and repeatable if causality is both internal and stable; only ability fulfills both conditions (Weiner, Frieze, Kukla, Reed, & Rosenbaum, cited in Nieva & Gutek, 1980). Because of sex-role stereotyping, a woman's successful performance is often attributed to effort, task ease, or luck, as opposed to ability (Deaux, 1976; Deaux & Emswiller, 1974; Feldman-Summers & Kiesler, 1974). Unexpected success, such as high task performance by women, is attributed to extra effort and therefore worthy of higher praise than similar performance by males (Taynor & Deaux, 1973). Heilman and Guzzo (1978), however, found fewer and less desirable organizational rewards associated with causal explanations for females. Promotion was seen as an appropriate reward for ability, while pay raises were seen as an appropriate reward for success due to effort. Nieva and Gutek (1980) in their review of research on evaluation of males and females identify three factors affecting researchers' findings: the level of inference required in the evaluation situation, the effects of sex-role incongruence, and the effect of level of qualifications or performance involved.

On the other hand, less research has concentrated on the characteristics and evaluation of successful versus unsuccessful women managers. Brown (1979) reviewed research which profiled the successful woman manager. Almost all female managers, for example, are pleased with their work, enjoy successes, and hold the same expectations of their positions as male managers. They gain satisfaction from solving problems, using their talents, and managing other people (Larwood & Wood, 1977). Koff (1973), in comparing successful and unsuccessful women managers, found that the higher the level of skill of a woman manager and the longer she stayed with an organization, the more likely she was to be seen as successful.

Ritchie and Moses (1983) found a significant relationship between AT & T assessment center predictions for 1097 women managers and their career progress seven years later. Assessment techniques included an in-basket, two-group exercises, an interview, a written exercise, and two paper-and-pencil tests. Based on reports prepared on performance in the assessment exercises, each woman was evaluated on 18 dimensions previously demonstrated in the literature to be related to management success. Women were also given an overall rating on a four-point scale pertaining to their middle management potential, ranging from "not acceptable" to "more than acceptable". For those not recommended as having middle management potential, there were three dimensions on which significant differences were found between women who achieved middle management and those who did not: need for advancement, organizing and planning, and scholastic aptitude. For those who were recommended as having middle management

potential, nine dimensions differentiated between those who reached middle management and those who did not: need for advancement, resistance to stress, inner work standards, energy, leadership, forcefulness, behavior flexibility, and oral and written communication.

Focusing on the complex relationships between self and supervisory evaluations as they relate to organizational performance, the present study has investigated the communication proficiency and training needs of female professionals as predictors of female organizational achievement levels. Although numerous studies have identified communication skills as critical factors in career preparation, interviewing, and overall organizational success (Goodall & Goodall, 1982), Hagge-Greenberg, 1979; Phillips, 1982), no previous work has explored communication factors as predictors of female professionals' achievement levels. In this study, we have investigated the issues of communication competency and training needs both from the perspectives of self assessment and supervisors' assessments. More particularly, we have examined these communication issues as predictors of females' achievement levels as measured by a modified MAQ, Managerial Achievement Quotient (Rhodes, cited in Blake & Mouton, 1964). Due to the complexity of the issue and the seeming contradictions found in previous research, this study is exploratory in nature and intended to generate research hypotheses.

Sample

Survey respondents were 61 female professionals and their 61 direct supervisors all employed within private industry and governmental agencies within the _____ community. Occupation classifications for the female

professionals were support personnel, technical, technical professional, supervisor, and manager. Specific occupation classifications were not reported for supervisors.

Procedures and Instrument

All participants self-administered a communication proficiency and training survey designed to assess present level of proficiency in a variety of competency areas and to determine future communication training needs. Questionnaires for both female professionals and their supervisors were mailed to past participants in a university management development program for women. Program participants were asked to retain a survey packet for themselves and distribute a survey packet to their immediate supervisors. Both packets included letters describing the research project, questionnaires, and individual return envelopes. The overall response rate was 21 percent.

The questionnaire for the female professional asked for assessment of her present level of proficiency and her future training needs for a variety of communication competency areas. The survey for supervisors requested a proficiency assessment and future training need identification for the supervisor's specific subordinate participating in the research project. Questionnaires were coded to permit matching of supervisor and subordinate responses.

We were particularly interested in assessments of specific critical skills identified in recent organizational communication literature (Hanna, 1978; DiSalvo, 1980): business writing, interviewing, group decision-making processes, oral presentations, managing conflict,

leadership/management techniques, interpersonal relationships, communications technology (computers, telecommunication, etc.), listening, motivating people, handling grievances, giving directions, delegating authority, negotiating skills, and diagnosing organizational problems. Since existing instruments do not cover all of these areas, we adapted an unpublished instrument devised by S. E. Jones, the "Social Skills Inventory". A scale of one to seven was used to rate the degree of proficiency or training need for each competency. For the proficiency assessment a scale of one to seven was used to rate the degree of proficiency for each competency. Rating categories were labeled as follows: 1=weak; 2=fair; 3=somewhat good, 4=average; 5=rather good; 6=very good; and 7=exceptional (S. E. Jones, personal communication, April 6, 1984). For the importance of future training evaluation a scale of one to seven was used to rate the degree of importance for each competency. Rating categories for training were as follows: 1=extremely unimportant; 2=unimportant; 3=somewhat unimportant; 4=somewhat important; 5=rather important; 6=very important; and 7=extremely important. Cronbach's alphas (reported later) indicate reliability in supervisor and subordinate scales.

Survey participants were also asked for particular demographic information which was to be used in computing their Managerial Achievement Quotients: the number of promotions received since initial employment with the organization for which they now work and current age (20-24, 25-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, or over 60)

The Rhodes Managerial Achievement Quotient (MAQ) provides an

evaluation of an employee's career progress in light of his or her chronological age, taking into account the number of career moves necessary to reach the top of most organizations. Hall and Donnell (1979) modified the basic formula to fit their particular research model. We used the following modified formula:

$$MAQ = \frac{5\ (\text{number of promotions})}{(\text{mean age per category}) - 20} \times 100$$

MAQ categorizes a population into achievement levels, ranging from low to high. In the numerator, the number 5 is a constant progression factor which represents time in grade per number of career moves available if one spent his or her 40-year work life in an eight-level (the number of levels identified by Blake and Mouton in their original study) organization and which reflects potential upward mobility, assuming the absence of intervening forces such as seniority, politics, etc. The denominator provides a seniority index. In the above formula, mean age was used since participants marked age by category rather than filling in a blank; twenty represents an average entry level age. Finally, a constant multipler of 100 is used to eliminate decimals (Hall & Donnell, 1979). Rhodes original formula, used by Blake and Mouton, was applied to individuals in a single organization. The present study surveyed female professionals from approximately 35 organizations; therefore, the original formula was modified in order to provide achievement evaluations of individual female professionals working within specific organizations.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed with step-wise multiple regression equations. Specifically, 60 proficiency and training need variables were utilized to

predict the achievement levels of 61 female professionals as rated by 61 females and 61 supervisors. Thirty variables represented supervisor ratings and thirty were self ratings.

RESULTS

Cronbach's alphas were calculated for each of the four general competency/proficiency scales. Cornbach's alpha for the supervisor proficiency ratings was .92; supervisor training need .94; subordinate proficiency .82; and subordinate training need .92. Collectively, 25 variables were shown to be statistically significant ($F_{25,36}=114.59$, $p< .0000001$) for predicting achievement levels with the step-wise multiple regression technique. The 25 variables accounted for .99 of the variance with $R^2=.98759$ and an adjusted R^2 of .97897. The adjusted R^2 is of particular importance in this equation because the number of predictor variables is large compared to the sample size. Theil (1971) demonstrates that in a linear model (as in this equation) the adjusted R^2 is a correction for overly optimistic performance of large numbers of predictor variables in relatively small samples. Additionally, $\Sigma_h(R^2-R_h^2)$ yields an estimate of the multicollinearity effect in regression equations. In order to minimize the multicollinearity effect of a large number of predictor variables, a tolerance for the model (the proportion of variability in an independent variable not explained by the other independent variables) was set at .01 to enter and .001 to default. The additive nature of the resulting equation--additional explained variance with each step (Table 2)--illustrates the viability of the model (adjusted $R^2=.98$ with minimal multicollinearity) despite the large number of variables and small sample size.

Of the 25 variables, 15 rated proficiency and 10 evaluated training needs. Twelve were self ratings and 13 were supervisor ratings. Table 1 reports the intercorrelations of the variables included in the study. Variables were both positively and negatively associated with one another at generally low levels. Table 2 summarizes the results of the step-wise regression analysis.

Seven of the variables are of particular explanatory importance. Specifically, three self-rating variables (proficiency in giving directions, motivating people, and group decision-making) and four supervisor ratings (proficiency in managing conflict, motivating people, business writing, and diagnosing organizational problems) accounted for .43 of the variance. The remaining variables made individual contributions to the variance ranging from .01 to .05.

An examination of the regression coefficients from the equation identified 14 of the 25 variables as contributing to higher achievement levels with the 11 remaining variables negatively related to achievement. For the seven variables accounting for .43 of the variance, four (self proficiency ratings for giving directions and group decision-making processes and supervisor proficiency ratings for motivating people and diagnosing organizational problems) contributed to higher achievement while three (supervisor proficiency ratings for managing conflict and business writing and self proficiency rating for motivating people) predicted lower achievement levels.

DISCUSSION

The large number of variables in the regression equation underscores the complexity of evaluation as it relates to promotional progress. With 25 communication and training variables accounting for .99 of the variance, the singular most powerful finding of this research on female professionals is the importance of self and supervisor evaluation of communication competencies for organizational achievement. Additionally, these findings support previous work describing the importance in the organizational setting of the specific communication competencies used as achievement predictors in this study.

Specifically, the female professional whose supervisor evaluates highly her ability to motivate others and understand organizational problems is more likely to advance vertically in the organization than those not as highly evaluated. Likewise, the female professional who favorably evaluates her own ability to give directions and participate in groups is more likely to be a high achiever.

On the other hand, positive self and supervisor evaluations do not always contribute to vertical mobility. For example, the higher a supervisor evaluated a female subordinate in business writing and managing conflict, the less likely that subordinate was to be a high achiever. The female professional's rating of her own proficiency in motivating people was also a negative predictor of advancement.

Explanations for these seemingly unusual results raise important research questions. For example, previous research has identified a

talking platypus syndrome for females--high evaluations for exhibiting unexpected competencies. The negative relationship between business writing skills and advancement for females may be explained by the reverse of this syndrome--little reward associated with exhibiting an expected competency. The negative relationship between a supervisor's evaluation of a female professional's ability to handle conflict and her achievement level may also be explained by stereotyped expectations. Previous research along these lines supports the widely held notion that conflict is seen as counterproductive behavior in organizations and that the behavior of female professionals is expected to differ from that of their male counterparts.

The self and supervisory proficiency ratings for motivating people further illustrate the complexity of the relationship between supervisor and subordinate evaluations. For example, the higher the supervisory evaluation for motivating others, the higher the achievement level of the female professional. On the other hand, the higher the self evaluation for motivating others, the lower the achievement level. The lack of congruence in these findings supports previous research which reports little agreement in proficiency assessments between female professionals and their supervisors. These discrepancies become fundamental research questions for understanding both mobility opportunities for the female professional and seeming contradictions in previous work.

This research demonstrates not only the importance of communication competencies for female achievement but that self and supervisory proficiency ratings generally take precedence over training need

identification as predictors of achievement levels. Future research should continue to explore communication competencies as predictors of advancement for female professionals and begin to develop and compare competency/achievement models for male counterparts. Specifically, in addition to investigating whether and how the talking platypus syndrome and its reverse may operate for female professionals, these same issues should be understood for males. For both sexes, the influence of same-sex and mixed-sex dyads in the supervisor-subordinate evaluation process is of interest.

In sum, expanding research questions to understand how expected versus unexpected competencies relate to achievement for both males and females may be key to explaining why similar male and female behaviors have not resulted in similar promotional progress.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abramson, P. R., Goldberg, P. A., Greenberg, J. H., & Abramson, L. M. (1977). The talking platypus phenomenon: Competency ratings as a function of sex and professional status. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 2, 114-124.

Bartol, K. M. (1977). Male versus female organizational leaders: A review of comparative literature. Syracuse, NY: School of Management.

Bartol, K. M. (1978). The sex structuring of organizations: A search for possible causes. Academy of Management Review, 3, 805-815.

Birdsall, P. (1980). A comparative analysis of male and female managerial communication style in two organizations. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 16, 183-196.

Blake, R. R. & Mouton, J. S. (1964). The managerial grid. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company.

Brown, L. K. (1979). Women and business management. Signs, 5. 266-288.

Day, D. R., & Stogdill, R. M. (1972). Leader behavior of male and female supervisors: A comparative study. Personnel Psychology, 25, 353-360.

Deaux, K. (1976). Sex: A perspective on the attribution process. In J. H. Harvey, W. J. Ickes, & R. F. Kidd (Eds.), New directions in attribution research. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1976.

Deaux, K. (1979). Self-evaluations of male and female managers. Sex Roles, 5, 571-580.

Deaux, K., & Emswiller, T. (1974). Explanations of successful performance on sex-linked tasks: What is skill for the male is luck for the female. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 29, 80-85.

DiSalvo, V. (1980). A summary of current research: Identifying communication skills in various organizational contexts. Communication Education, 29, 283-290.

Donnell, S., & Hall, J. (1980). Men and women as managers: A significant case of no significant differences. The Woodlands, TX: Telemetrics International.

Ezell, H. F., Odewahn, C. A., & Sherman, J. D. (1980). Perceived competence of women managers in public human service organizations: A comparative view. Journal of Management, 6 (2), 135-144.

Feldman-Summers, S., & Kiesler, S. B. (1974). Those who are number two try harder: The effect of sex on attributions of causality. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30 (6), 846-855.

Fraker, S. (1984, April). Why women aren't getting to the top. Fortune, pp. 40-45.

Goodall, D., & Goodall, L. H., Jr. (1982). The employment interview: A selective review of the literature with implications for communication research. Communication Quarterly, 30 (2), 116-123.

Hagen, R. L., & Kahn, A. (1975). Discrimination against competent women. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 5, 362-376.

Hagge-Greenberg, L. (1979, August). The liberal arts employer survey: Opportunities for the liberal arts graduate. Midwest College Placement Association, p. 17.

Hall, F. S., & Hall, D. T. (1976). Effects of job incumbent's race and sex on evaluations of managerial performance. Academy of Management Journal, 19 (3), 476-481.

Hall, J., & Donnell, S. M. (1979). Managerial achievement: The personal side of behavioral theory. Human Relations, 32 (1), 77-101.

Hanna, M. S. (1978). Speech communication training needs in the business community. Central States Speech Journal, 29, 163-172.

Heilman, M. E., & Guzzo, R. A. (1978). The perceived cause of work success as a mediator of sex discrimination in organizations. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 21, 346-357.

Hollander, E. P., & Julian, J. W. (1979). Contemporary trends in the leadership process. Psychological Bulletin, 71, 387-397.

Jabes, Jak. (1980). Causal attributions and sex-role stereotypes in the perceptions of women managers. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 12 (1), 52-63.

Jacobson, M. B., & Effertz, J. (1974). Sex roles and leadership: Perceptions of the leaders and the led. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 12, 383-396.

Koff, L. A. (1973). Age, experience and success among women managers. Management Review, 62, 65-66.

Larwood, L., & Wood, M. (1977). Women in Management. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Massengill, D., & DiMarco, N. (1979). Sex-role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics: A current replication. Sex Roles, 5, 561-570.

Matteson, M. T. (1976). Attitudes toward women as managers: Sex or role-differences. Psychological Reports, 39, 166.

Miner, J. B. (1973). The real crunch in managerial manpower. Harvard Business Review, 51 (6), 146-158.

Nieva, V., & Gutek, B. (1980). Sex effects on evaluation. Academy of Management Review, 5 (2), 267-276.

Osborn, R. N., & Vicars, W. M. (1976). Sex stereotypes: An artifact in leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction analysis? Academy of Management Journal, 19, 439-449.

Patterson, R. A. (1975). Women in management: An experimental study of the effects of sex and marital status on job performance ratings, promotability ratings, and promotion decisions. Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 3108B-3109B.

Phillips, G. (1982). Communicating in organizations. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Ritchie, R. J., & Moses, J. L. (1983). Assessment center correlates of women's advancement into middle management: A 7-year longitudinal analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68 (2), 227-231.

Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T. H. (1973). The influence of sex-role stereotypes on evaluation of male and female supervisory behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 57, 44-48.

Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T. H. (1974a). Influence of sex role stereotypes on personnel decisions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, 9-14.

Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T. H. (1974b). Sex stereotyping in the executive suite. Harvard Business Review, 52 (2), 45-58.

Schein, V. E. (1973). The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among female managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60 (3), 340-344.

Schein, V. E. (1978). Sex role stereotyping, ability and performance: Prior research and new directions. Personnel Psychology, 31, 259-268.

Shockley, P. S. (1981). The effects of sex differences on the preference for utilization of conflict styles of managers in a work setting: An exploratory study. Public Personnel Management, 10 (3), 289-295.

Shockley, P. S., & Staley, C. (1980). Women in management training programs: What they think about key issues. Public Personnel Management, 9 (3), 214-224.

Staley, C. (1984). Managerial women in mixed groups: Implications of recent research. Group & Organization Studies, 9 (3), 316-332.

Staley, C. & Shockley-Zalabak, P. (1984). Communication proficiency and future training needs of the female professional: Self-assessment versus supervisors' evaluations. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Taynor, J., & Deaux, K. (1973). When women are more deserving than men: Equity, attribution, and perceived sex differences. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 28 (3), 360-367.

Theil, H. (1971). Principles of econometrics. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Tsui, A. S., & Gutek, B. A. (1984). A role set analysis of gender differences in performance, affective relationships, and career success of industrial middle managers. Academy of Management Journal, 27 (3), 619-635.

White, M. C., Crino, M. D., & DeSanctis, G. L. (1981). A critical review of female performance, performance training and organizational initiatives designed to aid women in the work-role environment. Personnel Psychology, 34 (2), 227-248.

Wood, M. M. (1976). Women in management: How is it working out? Advanced Management Journal, 41 (1), 22-30.

TABLE 1

Intercorrelations of Variables in the Study

Variable	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
Giving Directions (PB)*	.10	.12	-.08	.37	.12	.27	.27	.30	.14	.17	.00	-.15	.07	.07	-.27	.16	.11	.11	-.20	.07	.29	.27	.01	.11
Managing Conflict (PA)	-	.45	.28	.07	.54	.04	.06	.12	-.15	-.08	-.09	.07	.47	.50	.12	.06	.05	.49	.01	-.17	.11	-.06	-.12	-.08
Motivating People (PA)		-	.48	.14	.34	.08	-.03	.07	-.12	.28	.22	.23	.69	.59	.28	.02	-.03	.14	.33	.17	.09	-.03	-.02	.03
Business Writing (PA)			-	-.08	.42	.09	-.10	-.13	-.10	.24	.17	.40	.47	.47	.22	-.02	.00	-.03	.27	-.07	-.11	.20	.04	.11
Motivating People (PB)				-	.06	.46	.27	.33	.09	.14	.01	-.06	-.04	.11	-.05	.23	.11	-.01	.04	.16	.38	.43	.50	-.02
Diagnosing Organizational Problems (PA)					-	-.07	.01	-.08	.11	.02	-.02	.14	.50	.43	.09	.01	.03	.00	.05	-.18	.00	.11	.07	-.09
Group Decision-Making (PB)						-	.24	.45	.09	.00	-.01	.07	-.03	.06	-.27	.10	.07	-.07	-.03	-.01	.16	.44	.10	.10
Listening							-	.31	.25	.00	-.08	.02	-.02	-.07	-.13	.28	.29	-.09	-.23	-.07	.13	.05	.24	.14
Managing Conflict (PB)								-	-.11	.02	.02	-.08	.01	.04	-.13	.11	-.06	-.05	-.07	.00	.24	.25	.07	.13
Interviewing (TB)									-	.19	.26	.05	-.06	-.08	.07	.40	.26	.16	.09	.08	.06	-.06	.34	-.05
Negotiating (TA)										-	.58	.29	.25	.18	.39	.09	.01	.48	.67	.42	.20	.06	.03	.00
Oral Presentations (TA)											-	.42	.19	.07	.52	.00	.16	.45	.57	.33	.13	-.08	-.08	.20
Communications Technology (PA)												-	.23	.17	.21	.02	.10	.23	.34	.17	-.03	.14	.19	.52
Group Decision-Making (PA)													-	.58	.30	.02	-.02	.38	.31	.04	.09	-.11	-.00	-.08
Interviewing (PA)														-	.15	.26	-.02	-.04	.20	-.06	.07	.13	.12	-.09
Business Writing (TA)															-	-.02	.08	.39	.47	.49	.16	-.18	-.16	-.07
Diagnosing Organizational Problems (TB)																-	.34	-.20	-.01	-.05	.09	.14	.62	.17
Business Writing (TB)																	-	.03	.07	.03	.01	-.10	.31	.13
Listening (TA)																		-	.65	.72	.09	-.03	-.23	.20
Motivating People (TA)																			-	.52	.05	.08	-.03	.13
Interpersonal Communication (TA)																				-	.10	.03	-.17	-.06
Delegating Authority (PB)																					-	.11	.09	.06
Oral Presentations (PB)																						-	.14	.23
Negotiating (TB)																							-	.08
Communications Technology (PB)																								-

* Variable identification: (PA), Supervisor proficiency; (PB), Self proficiency; (TA), Supervisor training need; (TB), Self training need.

TABLE 2

Summary of Step-Wise Regression Analysis for Predicting Organizational Achievement Levels

Rating Catetories	Multiple R	R^2	R^2 Change	r	Beta	F
Giving Directions (PB)*	0.247	0.061	0.061	0.247	0.239	3.89
Managing Conflict (PA)	0.336	0.113	0.052	-0.203	-0.738	3.75
Motivating People (PA)	0.427	0.182	0.069	0.165	0.457	4.31
Business Writing (PA)	0.490	0.240	0.058	-0.183	-0.755	4.50
Motivating People (PB)	0.550	0.302	0.062	-0.094	-0.604	4.85**
Diagnosing Organizational Problems (PA)	0.598	0.357	0.055	0.050	0.659	5.10
Group Decision-Making (PB)	0.654	0.428	0.071	0.129	0.347	5.77
Listening (PB)	0.681	0.464	0.036	0.208	0.465	5.73
Managing Conflict (PB)	0.702	0.493	0.030	-0.036	-0.117	5.63
Interviewing (TB)	0.725	0.526	0.033	0.040	-0.002	5.66
Negotiating (TA)	0.751	0.564	0.038	0.129	0.351	5.88
Oral Presentations (TA)	0.783	0.613	0.049	-0.115	-0.645	6.47
Communications Technology (PA)	0.813	0.660	0.047	0.125	0.343	7.17

Rating Catetories	Multiple R	R^2	R^2 Change	r	Beta	F
Group Decision-Making (PA)	0.829	0.688	0.028	-0.009	-0.424	7.40
Interviewing (PA)	0.847	0.718	0.030	0.059	0.539	7.80
Business Writing (TA)	0.865	0.748	0.030	-0.095	0.032	8.36
Diagnosing Organizational Problems (TB)	0.877	0.770	0.022	-0.130	-0.421	8.66
Business Writing (TB)	0.892	0.796	0.026	0.007	0.286	9.35
Listening (TA)	0.904	0.817	0.021	0.118	-0.840	9.89
Motivating People (TA)	0.928	0.862	0.044	0.082	0.507	12.77
Interpersonal Communication (TA)	0.948	0.899	0.037	0.170	0.514	16.91
Delegating Authority (PB)	0.962	0.926	0.027	0.053	0.206	22.19
Oral Presentations (PB)	0.974	0.949	0.023	-0.027	-0.251	30.74
Negotiating (TB)	0.984	0.969	0.020	0.003	-0.226	47.91
Communications Technology (PB)	0.994	0.988	0.019	0.150	0.208	114.59

* Variable identification: (PA), Supervisor proficiency; (PB), Self proficiency; (TA), Supervisor training need; (TB), Self training need.
** All remaining F values for variables 5-25 are significant at the $p < .001$.